UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/201,749	12/01/98	ONG	P 11

TM02/0508

KEVIN M MASON
RYAN & MASON
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY NY 11560

EXAMINER
COLBERT,E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	7

DATE MAILED:
05/08/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 February 2001</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

16)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

17)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

18)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

19)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

20)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   Claims 1-28 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 28 were

amended in this correspondence.

2.   Applicant's response of 20 February 2001 to the Office Action has been entered

as Amendment A, paper number 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
> United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
> by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
> title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4.   Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Ingrassia, Jr. et al (US Patent #5,941,957), hereafter Ingrassia.

With respect to independent claim 1, Ingrassia discloses a method for providing

an electronic document having multiple versions, each of the said versions identified by

a time-stamp, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for said electronic document, said request including a time-

stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65);

identifying as a function of the said time-stamp a machine storing a version of

said electronic document for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7,

lines 30-65); and

transmitting said electronic document corresponding to said time-stamp from said identified machine (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to dependent claim 2, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein an address identifying said document includes said time-stamp (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to dependent claim 3, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claims 1-2 wherein said address identifying said electronic document includes said time-stamp (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to dependent claim 4, Ingrassia disclosed the method according to claims 1-3 wherein said Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating said stamp (col. 8, line 56-col. 9, line 27).

With respect to dependent claim 5, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising the step of transmitting the version of said electronic document with the most recent time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of said electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp (col. 8, line 56-col. 9, line 27).

With respect to dependent claim 6, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein said request is specified using a browser (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to dependent claim 7, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein said time-stamp is a relative time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to independent claim 8, Ingrassia discloses a system for storing an electronic document having multiple versions, said system comprising:

a memory for storing said multiple versions of said electronic document in an

archive of electronic documents, and a processor operatively coupled to said memory,

said processor configured to (col. 7, lines 30-65);

receive a request for said electronic document, said request including a time-

stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65);

identify as a function of said time-stamp a machine storing said electronic

document for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65); and

transmit said electronic document corresponding to said time-stamp from said

identifier machine (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to claim 9, Ingrassia discloses the system according to claim 8

wherein an address identifying said electronic document includes said time-stamp (col.

8, lines 6-49).

With respect to dependent claim 10, Ingrassia discloses the system according to

claims 8-9 wherein said address is a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (col. 8, lines 6-

47).

With respect to dependent claim11, Ingrassia discloses the system according to

claims 8-10 wherein said Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request

header for indicating said stamp (col. 8, lines 56-Col. 9, line 27).

With request to dependent claim 12, Ingrassia discloses the system according to

claim 8 wherein said request is specified using a browser (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to dependent claim 13, Ingrassia discloses the system according to

claim 8 to further comprising the step of transmitting the version of said electronic

document with the most recent time-stamp preceding the requested time-stamp if a version of said electronic document does not exist with the requested time-stamp (col. 8, line 56-col. 9, line 27).

With respect to dependent claim 14, Ingrassia discloses the system according to claim 8 wherein said time-stamp is a relative time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to independent claim 15, Ingrassia discloses an article of manufacture for accessing an electronic document, said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being identified by a time-stamp, said article of manufacture comprising:

A computer readable medium having computer readable program code means embodies therein, said computer readable program code means comprising program code means for causing a computer to (col. 7, lines 30-65);

receive a request for said electronic document, said request including a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65);

identify as a function of said time-stamp a machine storing a version of said electronic document for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65); and

transmit said electronic document corresponding to said time-stamp from said identifier machine (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to independent claim 16, Ingrassia discloses a method for resolving a domain name, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request for said electronic document associated with said domain

name, said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being

identified by a time-stamp, said request including a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65);

Identifying as a function of said time-stamp a machine corresponding to a version

of said domain name for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines

30-65) and

transmitting an indication of said identified machine storing said electronic

document corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to dependent claim 17, Ingrassia discloses the method according to

claim 16 wherein an address identifying said electronic document includes said time-

stamp (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to dependent claim 18, Ingrassia discloses the method according to

claims 16-17 wherein a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to dependent claim 19, Ingrassia discloses the method according to

claims 16-18 wherein a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request

header for indicating said stamp (col. 8, line 56 – col. 9, line 27).

With respect to claim dependent claim 20, Ingrassia discloses the method

according to claim 16 wherein said request is specified using a browser (col. 7, lines 30-

65).

With respect to dependent claim 21, Ingrassia discloses the method according to

claim 16 wherein said time-stamp is a relative time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to independent claim 22, Ingrassia discloses a system for resolving a domain name, said system comprising:

a memory for storing a database identifying a machine storing an electronic document corresponding to said domain name for a plurality of time periods (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52);

a processor operatively coupled to said memory configured to receive a request for an electronic document associated with the domain name (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52), said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being identified by a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 49-62);

said request including a time-stamp; access said database as a function of said time-stamp to identify a machine corresponding to a version of said domain name for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52); and

transmit an indication of said identified machine storing electronic document corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52).

With respect to dependent claim 23, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 22 wherein said an address identifying said electronic document includes said time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to dependent claim 24, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claims 22-23 wherein said address is a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") (col. 8, lines 6-47).

With respect to dependent claim 25, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claims 22-24 wherein said Uniform Resource Locator has an associated request header for indicating said time-stamp (col. 8, lines 56-col. 9, line 27).

With respect to dependent claim 26, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 22 wherein said request is specified using a browser (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to dependent claim 27, Ingrassia discloses the method according to claim 22 wherein said time-stamp is a relative time-stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65).

With respect to claim 28, Ingrassia discloses an article of manufacture for resolving domain name, said article of manufacture comprising:

a computer readable medium having program code means embodied thereon (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52), said computer readable program code means comprising program code means for causing a computer to (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52);

receive a request for an electronic document associated with said domain name (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52), said electronic document having multiple versions, each of said versions being identified by a time-stamp (col. 7, lines 49-62), said request including a time-stamp; identify as a function of said time-stamp a machine corresponding to a version of said domain name for a time period corresponding to said time-stamp (col. 7, 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52); and

transmit an indication of said identified machine storing said electronic document corresponding to said time stamp (col. 7, lines 30-65 and col. 16, lines 22-52).

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 02/21/01 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's argument: Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest a

time-stamp in a URL to identify a particular version of a multiple-version document , as

required by each of the independent claims of the present invention is not deemed

persuasive because the claim limitations are not the original claim limitations for

independent claims 1,8, 15, 16, 23, and 28 and are considered "moot" based on the

Applicant's amendment to the independent claims.

With respect to Applicant's argument: Ingrassia does not disclose or suggest

identifying a machine storing a version of said electronic document for a time period ...

is not deemed persuasive because the claim limitations are not the original claim

limitations for independent claims 1,8, 15, 16, 23, and 28 and are considered "moot"

based on Applicant's amendment to the independent claims.

The Examiner is entitled to give the claim limitations their broadest reasonable

interpretation in light of the Specification (see below):

2111   Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation [R-1]

>CLAIMS MUST BE GIVEN THEIR BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

*During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable
interpretation consistent with the specification." Applicant always has the opportunity to amend
the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility
that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162
USPO 541,550-51 (CCA 1969) (Claim 9 was directed to a process of analyzing data generated
by mass spectrographic analysis of a gas. The process comprised selecting the data to be
analyzed by subjecting the data to a mathematical manipulation. The examiner made rejections
under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 102. In the section 102 rejection, the examiner explained that the
claim was anticipated by a mental process augmented by pencil and paper markings. The court*

agreed that the claim was not limited to using a machine to carry out the process since the claim did not explicitly set forth the machine. The court explained that "(reading a claim in light of the specification, to thereby interpret limitations explicitly recited in the claim, is a quite different thing from 'reading limitations of the specification into a claim,' to thereby narrow the scope of the claim by implicitly adding disclosed limitations which have no express basis in the claim. "The court found that applicant was advocating the latter, e.g., the impermissible importation of subject matter from the specification into the claim.).<

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

Applicant's disclosure.

Kappe (US Patent 5,805,824) teaches a method for propagating data through a

distributed system.

Shoham (US Patent 5,855,015) teaches a method for retrieving hyperlinked

information resources.

Greer et al (US Patent 5,978,828) teaches a URL bookmark update notification

system.

7.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on **Monday-Thursday from 6:30 am -5:00 pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 703-305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-9051 for regular communications and 703-308-9051 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-96000.

E. Colbert

May 2, 2001

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100